

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated October 20, 2005. Claims 1 to 40 are presented for examination, of which Claims 1, 33 and 40 have been amended. Claims 1 and 33 are the independent claims herein. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

The Applicants and their undersigned attorney thank Examiner Lee for his courtesies and thoughtful treatment afforded during an interview conducted by telephone on January 12, 2006. Also present at the interview were Primary Examiner Larry Donaghue (on behalf of the PTO) and Michael Guzniczak and Sivon Kalminov (on behalf of the Applicants). Applicants' Statement of the Summary of the Interview follows.

During the interview, the § 103(a) rejections of independent Claims 1 and 33 were discussed, specifically the rejections over U.S. Patent No. 6,240,456 (Teng). It was explained that the present invention includes redirecting of messages that are not necessarily addressed to the claimed "computing device", and rather are addressed to target network devices residing on a local network, whereas in Teng all messages are addressed to the network server. Particular attention was focused on Column 5, wherein Teng discloses that the URL address for a logical endpoint (e.g., the printer 50) has a basic form corresponding to "HTTP://server/share/share_name/.../item". Teng, Column 5, line 55 (emphasis added). Thus, it was explained that although the HTTP message of Teng might be routed to a logical endpoint, Teng shows that the message is addressed to the network server and not to the endpoint. During the interview, Applicants offered to make amendments to make this distinction more apparent. In this regard, Applicants have made amendments to the claims which are believed to clarify this feature.

Additionally, it was explained during the interview that Teng is not seen to show the feature of determining if an application module residing in the computing device is configured to process a functionality requested by an incoming message. In this regard, it was explained that while messages might be redirected in Teng, the redirection is not based on a determination of whether a computing device is configured to process a functionality requested by a message. In particular, it was explained that the existence of installable components 126 does not disclose a determination of whether they are configured to process the functionality requested by a message. For example, if installable component 126 was configured to poll the printer (as given in Teng), a request to fax a document would lead to failure, as there would be no determination of whether the component was configured to do anything but poll the printer. Thus, it was explained that Teng fails to disclose or suggest the determination featured in the present invention.

At the interview, it was mentioned that the rejections under § 112 and § 101 would be addressed in this written response. With respect to the rejections under § 112, Claims 2 to 32 and 34 to 40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for alleged indefiniteness. Specifically, with respect to dependent Claims 2 to 32 and 37 to 40, the Office Action apparently required replacement of "A method" with "The method". This rejection is respectfully traversed, for the reason that the language used in the claims is precisely the same as that recommended by the PTO itself. See MPEP § 608.01(n). With respect to dependent Claims 34 to 36, the Office Action stated that the claims were uncertain as to which claim was being performed. This rejection is also traversed, again because the MPEP specifically authorizes the language used in these claims. See MPEP § 608.01(n) and page 600-83. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 112 rejections are therefore respectfully requested.

Claims 35 and 36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 for allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. In particular, the Office Action stated that the claimed "computer-readable medium" could be interpreted as a carrier wave, which allegedly is non-statutory subject matter. This rejection is respectfully traversed. The language of Claims 35 and 36 specifically states that the computer-readable medium "stores computer-executable process steps", such that it is not understood how the claim might be read as a "carrier wave". Furthermore, even accepting the Office Action's characterization of Claims 35 and 36, the Office Action does not cite any authority for the position that a "carrier wave" is non-statutory. Thus, it is not seen how Claims 35 and 36 are non-statutory. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are therefore respectfully requested.

In light of the points made during the interview and the foregoing amendments and remarks, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and Applicants respectfully request same.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael K. O'Neill
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No.: 32,622

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 107622v1